



3742

Attorney Docket No. 9817-000153

UNIT  
EXAMINER  
INVENTOR(S)  
SERIAL NUMBER  
FILED

3742  
Mark Paschall  
Blok et al.  
09/686,227  
October 11, 2000

**RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL AND  
EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST  
(IF REQUIRED)**

FOR Conductive Polymer Compositions Containing N-N-m-phenylenedimaleimide and Devices

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

FEE CALCULATION FOR ENCLOSED RESPONSE and EXTENSION REQUEST (if any)									
	Claims Remaining		Highest No. Previously Paid		Number Extra		Rate		Additional Fee
Total Claims	29	-	29	=	0	x	\$18.00	=	0.00
Independent Claims	2	-	3	=	0	x	\$78.00	=	0.00
Surcharge For Multiple Dependent Claim First Added							+\$260.00	=	0.00
[ ] Applicant requests a _____ month extension of time for response to the outstanding Office Action. The <b>large entity</b> fee is									0.00
TOTAL									0.00
[ ] SMALL ENTITY STATUS (If applicable, divide TOTAL by 2)									0.00
[ ] Verified Statement enclosed, if not previously filed.									
[ ] Reduction for Extension Fee of _____ months already paid									0.00
[ ] OTHER: _____									0.00
TOTAL									0.00

[ ] A check is enclosed to cover the fees as calculated above.

[ ] The fees calculated above are to be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-0750.

If for some reason applicant has not requested a sufficient extension of time and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension of time necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a Request for an Extension for the required time period and/or an authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any fee which may be due. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

P. O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:

*Robert M. Siminski*  
Robert M. Siminski  
Reg. No.36,007

RECEIVED  
JAN 22 2001  
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

I hereby certify that this letter, the response attached hereto and, if enclosed, the small entity verification are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on

January 12, 2001

By

*Robert M. Siminski*



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit: 3742 )  
Examiner: Mark Paschall )  
Inventor: Blok et al. )  
Serial No: 09/686,227 )  
Filed: October 11, 2000 )  
For: Conductive Polymer )  
Compositions Containing )  
N-N-m-phenylenedimaleimide )  
and Devices )  
Attorney )  
Docket No.: 9817-000153 )

RESPONSIVE  
AMENDMENT

TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

JAN 22 2001

RECEIVED

Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 19, 2000, please reconsider the above identified patent application in view of the following appended remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-22 and 24-29 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Carlet or Meyer in view of Kotian et al. In this regard, the

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

***I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on*** January 13, 2001

***By:*** Robert M. Smith